PR19 Customer Challenge Group – Research Methodology Sub-Group

Meeting number: 8

Meeting Date: 27th March 2018

Paper No: 1

Agenda No: 1

Title: Minutes from the last meeting, Challenge Log and Action Log

Author: Nicola Blake

Printing: This document does not contain any graphs or pictures and therefore does not require you to print in colour.

What is this paper about:	Minutes from the last Sub-Group meeting. Challenge Log and Actions from previous Sub-Group meeting.
Action needed from the CCG:	The Chair is seeking the Sub-Group's approval that the previous meeting minutes are a true and fair reflection of the meeting. The Chair is seeking the Sub-Group's views on the updated Challenge Log and Action Log.

Notes of Meeting No.7 of the South East Water CCG Customer Research Sub-Group

5th March 2018, South East Water, Head Office, Snodland.

Present:
Zoe McLeod (Chair)
Leslie Sopp (Independent – research and insight)
Alison Lee (AL) (SEW)
Nicola Blake (NB) (SEW)
Jane Gould (JG) (Create 51)

Apologies:
Mairi Budge (MB) (Independent – research and behaviour change)
Karen Gibbs (KG) (CCW)
Oliver Martin (OM) (SEW)
Laura Rafferty (LR) (SEW)
Jo Osborn (JO) (SEW)

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
1. Introduction	Apologies were received from MB, KG, OM, LR and JO. ZM and LS discussed changing the level of attendance needed for the group to be quorate to 50% due to members' workloads causing difficulty to attend; subject to agreement from the main CCG going forward the Sub-Group will go ahead with a minimum number of 2 members.
2. Declaration of Interest	The Sub-Group had no interests to declare at this meeting.
3. Minutes and actions from the last meeting	ZM has a number of comments on the minutes from the last meeting and would like PS and AM to review them before agreeing the final version.
4. Triangulation and WRMP update	The Company has used ICS to undertake an assurance/ gap analysis review of the triangulation approach used in stage one (the what) by the Company and to provide recommendations on the process to be used for stage two (the how). ICS has also carried out a similar assurance/ gap analysis review of the WRMP engagement carried out to date and recommended where additional research may be necessary to provide a more robust evidence base on which decisions will be made. The challenges and issues raised by ICS are not misaligned with the views of SEW, and are also similar to those that the Sub-Group have raised. The Sub-Group felt the Company's approach to triangulation was quite 'process driven' - while they understood the practical reasons for this they stressed: - Need for flexibility – careful what evidence is ruled out – this is recognised by SEW - That SEW would need to take account of the different quality of individual pieces of research that was undertaken e.g. some research had been more successful than others. - The need to be transparent about where the conflicts are - e.g. where research suggested different things - Need to consider how SEW manage tensions between the challenges and views of small groups e.g. a minority might face persistent or regular problems and the 'average consumer' e.g. with regards to pockets of customers with poor quality of water/low

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	pressure. Also between short-term and long-term interests e.g. paying today versus paying in the future.
	SEW needs to be clear on the value judgments that are being made during triangulation and which underpin any discussions and decisions.
	The Sub-Group raised some concern around the timing of the triangulation work and felt it did not leave much room at the end of the process if any additional work was needed. SEW acknowledged the timescales were tight but that progress would now be made on developing the framework for stage 2 so that triangulation activity could occur as soon as possible.
	In relation to WRMP, ICS have recommended the Company carries out further qualitative and quantitative research for the WRMP; this is highly supported and was already recognised as being required by the Company e.g. having further deliberations with customers on leakage and PCC ambitions. The Company is currently awaiting a further proposal from ICS which is will share with the Sub Group as soon as it is available.
	Actions from this discussion were:
	• To update the list of the evidence and insight from Stage 1 that will feed into the Stage 2 evidence base for triangulation.
5. Willingness to pay – debrief summary	The full Willingness to Pay debrief was not available, however a full debrief will be provided at the main CCG meeting. AL provided a few provisional headlines which revealed that the three attributes where there was most WTP were leakage, interruptions, and carbon emissions.
	Those attributes which attracted the least WTP were temporary use bans and single source of supply. The Sub-Group expressed their surprise that carbon emissions was higher up the rankings and queried if that might be due to the inclusion of renewable energy in the descriptor.
	SEW highlighted that the provisional WTP research suggested that climate change had risen up the public consciousness agenda more generally.
	Actions from this discussion were:
	• To articulate how SEW will understand if WTP is low because customers expect a high level of service in that area already e.g. water quality - taste and odour and discolouration rankings were low for the WTP survey when previous and current research suggests these are always high priorities for customers. Is it that customers think this is important but don't think they should pay more for it as it should be part of basic service?
	• SEW to provide the CCG with a list of postcode areas that face particular problems or contentious issues e.g. persistently low pressure, unpopular infrastructure proposals. This is so that the CCG can pay particular scrutiny to the engagement undertaken in these areas.
	Challenges from this discussion were:
	• SEW to demonstrate how they selected the attributes for inclusion in the WTP research. The Sub-Group want to have confidence that the company is not imposing a restricted set of choices around attributes on customers.
	• SEW should break down the findings of their WTP and explore if those areas that have persistent problems e.g. low pressure, poor quality water have different WTP. If so they can then explore how they might seek to address this. There is a risk with relying on averages which overlooks the fact that certain groups of customers may face persistent problems.
	• To draw out in the findings those customer priorities/views that have changed since the research conducted for PR14 and to demonstrate how these are to be reflected in the business plan.

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
6. Resilience – debrief summary	The Sub-Group felt that that further steps needed to be taken to provide assurance that customers were making informed choices on some of the longer terms solutions. The sub-group felt that SEW still has not undertaken any real deliberative research and that the research to date did not generally provide customers with sufficient information to give an informed view on solutions for the future. Sometimes customers stated the limitations of being able to give an informed view themselves. The Sub-Group discussed the potential need to update parts of the research given the changing context over the last 12 months, especially in the last week since the rapid freeze/thaw incident and large numbers of customers being off-supply. Other issues raised included: • How the company will demonstrate that their targets are genuinely stretching. e.g. WTP research on leakage was framed within a 4%-15% reduction the Sub-Group raised concerns that repeating this framing for the additional WRMP research would naturally encourage the customer to opt in the middle of the range. AL said that previously customers had not expressed a desire to pay more for higher levels of leakage reductions, but recognised the recent events may have changed attitudes on this. It was suggested that the leakage reduction range could also be broadened out in the Supercharge tool to allow customers to go beyond a 15% reduction if they wanted to. It was felt this would be a useful way to check customer views on leakage targets. • Quality of the sample - the group sought further assurances that the groups recruited for the research were inclusive and representative of the customer base. • How SEW will articulate what it takes from the WTP results ie is WTP low for some attributes because customers care less about the issue or because actually they expect these issues to be addressed as part of the core service they get from their water company? For example water quality - taste and odour and discolouration were low on the WTP rankings but past and present customer research indicates these areas are still a high priority for customers. • Raised concerns about the infographic provided at the resilience workshops which contained a lot of jargon. AL explained this developed for Ofwat and was brought to the events to remind customers of the process of bringing water from source to tap which was conveyed in the video. The handout was not needed during the groups but had been distributed in case customers were struggling to engage with the topic. • The importance of capturing issues that arise around the main research aims. e.g. Group were pleased that SEW had captured views on house building and fracking. ZM keen to see broader recognition in plan of topics raised by customers during the research to date - such as apprenticeships, plastics, water fountains and questioned whether this should feed into the societal research. ZM asked if the supercharge exercise included comparative performance information. AL confirmed it did, the same text was used as that tested with customers for the main WTP survey.
7. Non-household priorities – debrief summary	The sub-group raised concerns about the quality of the NHH research findings report (considered it too superficial for this group) and the representativeness of the NHH research; they needed to see more detail on the sample and how that compared to SEW's NHH base. SEW added that the views of retailers and larger users had not yet been captured, which is an additional research exercise to come. SEW outlined their plans for a retailers questionnaire. This would go to 25 retailers - initially pitched as 15 minutes to try and encourage. ZM stated that the strength of opinion in the NHH group she observed on water quality and leakage did not appear to be reflected in the research summary. High street shops highlighted those NHH customers who would have concerns about a decline in footfall when roadworks were underway and how this negatively impacted their business.

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	There was a discussion on the company's research procurement process and how additional research specialists were being used. LS highlighted that SEW had a balance of providers - some continuity with Accent delivering key parts of the research for SEW plus a diversity of new ideas with new providers such as Brand Edge and ICS. Actions from this discussion were: • SEW to provide information on their research provider procurement - how and why they have chosen each research provider to provide assurance to the CCG that this has been well considered. • The Sub-Group would like Accent to give an honest self-assessment of the NHH research and what they thought was achieved in 2.5 hour groups. Challenges from this discussion were: • SEW to provide further information on how SEW estimated 95% of its NHH customer base was covered by the research. SEW to provide information on the characteristics of its businesses and the final segmentation approach used. (The CCG will not be able to establish if the NHH research is reaching who it needs to without this information).
8. Non-household retailer research	25 questionnaires will be sent to the Non-Household retailers for completion, EQ will then offer retailers time to carry out in-depth discussions. The aim of this research is to discover what retailers think their customers' priorities are and what the retailer's priorities are.
9. WTP triangulation / Supercharge	AL updated the Sub-Group on the Supercharge web gamification project, which is currently undergoing staff testing; a demo will be shown at the main CCG meeting. The Group expressed disappointment that this will not include a future consumer element but recognised that the additional £100k required to build this into the approach may not be proportionate spend. The current wording is undergoing final edits and will be shared with the main CCG over the next week. ZM asked for the number of web based responses for WTP; AL will get the figures from Accent. Actions from this discussion were: • SEW to request online response data from the WTP research. • SEW to share text in the Supercharge game with the Sub-Group.
10. Research forward plan	The Sub-group said they were really pleased to see that the Company had included financial transparency research in its forward engagement plan. LS requested further information on the rationale of how the methodological choices had been made for each future piece or research. The Sub-Group discussed the development of a one page document to summarise the methodological decisions made by the Company and also the sampling strategy and results of that. ZM felt there was still a gap in the research for future customers and testing customers' wider public interest when it came to water. While ICS have recommended future customers are picked up in the additional WRMP research, ZM still felt that this was a gap in the wider PR19 research. Actions from this discussion were: • One page summary as to the methodology and sampling rationale for different parts of the forward look on the research programme Challenges from this discussion were:

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	• The Sub-Group challenged the company to articulate where their segmentation approach would overlay on the research outlined and how that would then be applied to the business plan.
11. AOB	There were no additional business for this meeting.
12. Private session	ZM and LS discussed the forward work programme.

Summary of actions

Action	Owner
To update the list of the evidence and insight from Stage 1 that will feed into the Stage 2 evidence base for triangulation.	
To articulate how SEW will understand if WTP is low because customers expect a high level of service in that area already e.g. water quality - taste and odour and discolouration rankings were low for the WTP survey when previous and current research suggests these are always high priorities for customers.	
SEW to provide the CCG with a list of postcode areas that face particular problems or contentious issues e.g. persistently low pressure, unpopular infrastructure proposals. This is so that the CCG can pay particular scrutiny to the engagement undertaken in these areas.	
SEW to provide information on their research provider procurement - how and why they have chosen each research provider to provide assurance to the CCG that this has been well considered.	
The Sub-Group would like Accent to give an honest self-assessment of the NHH research and what they thought was achieved in 90 minutes.	
SEW to request online response data from the WTP research.	
SEW to share text in the Supercharge game with the Sub-Group.	
One page summary as to the methodology and sampling rationale for different parts of the forward look on the research programme.	

Summary of Challenges

Challenge
SEW to demonstrate how they selected the attributes for inclusion in the WTP research. The Sub-Group want to have confidence that the company is not imposing a restricted set of choices around attributes on customers.
SEW should break down the findings of their WTP and explore if those areas that have persistent problems e.g. low pressure, poor quality water have different WTP. If so they can then explore how they might seek to address this. There is a risk with relying on averages which overlooks the fact that certain groups of customers may face persistent problems.
To draw out in the findings those customer priorities/views that have changed since the research conducted for PR14 and to demonstrate how these are to be reflected in the business plan.
SEW to provide further information on how SEW estimated 95% of its NHH customer base was covered by the research. SEW to provide information on the characteristics of its businesses and the final segmentation approach used. (The CCG will not be able to establish if the NHH research is reaching who it needs to without this information).
The Sub-Group challenged the company to articulate where their values based segmentation approach would overlay on the research outlined and how that would then be applied to the business plan.

Challenge Log

Item	Raised by	Date Raised	Subject Matter	Comment/ Feedback/ Challenge	Response	Status (Open/Closed)
29	Sub-group	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW should consider all customer segments, in their research approach including customers in vulnerable situations, else may be left with gaps in engagement at the end.	This will be considered as part of the vulnerability strategy.	Closed
30	Sub-group	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	Accent to demonstrate their credentials on deliberative work and engaging customers with additional needs.	SEW will ask Accent for evidence of other work undertaken. Sent to CCG in Jan 18.	Closed
31	Sub-group	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to demonstrate how it is meeting the needs of non-tech savvy customers e.g. are their paper options for customers who don't feel comfortable using Apps? How inclusive is the App? /Are you doing home visits to reach some groups?	Paper versions of any pre-task material were issued to customers who did not have access to the App. Depth interviews being undertaken at different stages of the research programme where appropriate.	Closed
32	Leslie Sopp	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to explore the potential to use research to create enduring engagement communities.	To be included in overall engagement straegy.	Closed
33	Zoe McLeod	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to demonstrate how planning to engage/have engaged with business customers.	SEW to develop separate programme for business customer research as appropriate. - SEW presented NHH strategy to engagement sub-group on November 23rd.	Closed
34	Leslie Sopp	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	Explore piloting the approach at 3 hours rather than 2.5 or 5 and do at weekends. Risk that current approach is shoe horning research into SEW schedule rather than what will deliver the best outcome.	Approach to focus groups amended to pick up this challenge.	Closed
35	Sub-group	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	Consider peer review on the WTP research.	Peer reviewed has been completed. Results to be shared with research sub-group	Closed
54	Sub-group	24-Aug-17	Research Methodology sub-group	Trial different ways of presenting packages.	Agreed. Qualitative research to be conducted on 2nd and 6th November.	Closed
65	Sub-group	06-Oct-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to explore how people see their societal role as monopoly provider of an essential service.	Link to challenge 43.	Closed
66	Sub-group	06-Oct-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to validate non-household segments.	NHH segments discussed with research sub-group and Richard Lavendar. Confirmed that research programme will progress with proposed segments and be reviewed regularly to determine if segments needs to be altered (e.g. SME segment to be split into smaller segments).	Closed
67	Sub-group	06-Oct-17	Research Methodology sub-group	Map non-household stakeholder groups - for engagement.	This will be included in stakeholder mapping.	Open
72	Sub-group	23-Nov-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to provide an overview of the engagement strategy - not just the research element e.g. what are the overarching aims of your engagement.	Covered as part of overall engagement strategy and graphic - presented to CCG in Jan 18.	Closed
73	Sub-group	23-Nov-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to articulate/map the research questions wanted in triangulation to address (this was an issue also raised at the away day on engagement)	Part of triangualtion update to CCG.	Open
74	Sub-group	23-Nov-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to test the resilience materials and terms before wider rollout - the group welcomed the previous testing on the WTP materials and felt that was really useful.	Resilient customer research underway. Topic guides shared with research sub-group in advance.	Closed

Challenge Log

Item	Raised by	Date Raised	Subject Matter	Comment/ Feedback/ Challenge	Response	Status (Open/Closed)
75	Sub-group	23-Nov-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to review its approach to NHH engagement and provide rationale for proposed methodology.	Covered in regular updates to research sub-group.	Closed
76	Sub-group	23-Nov-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to find out how Supercharge ensure independent usability and inclusivity testing of their web tools.	User acceptance testing with customers carried out in Jan 18. SEW have confirmed to CCG sub-group that design of website will be based on maximum functionality of the game element. If customers involved in research need additional support this will be highlighted in the research.	Closed
90	Sub-group	05-Mar-18	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to demonstrate how they selected the attributes for inclusion in the WTP research. The Sub-Group want to have confidence that the company is not imposing a restricted set of choices around attributes on customers.		Open
91	Sub-group	05-Mar-18	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW should break down the findings of their WTP and explore if those areas that have persistent problems e.g. low pressure, poor quality water have different WTP. If so they can then explore how they might seek to address this. There is a risk with relying on averages which overlooks the fact that certain groups of customers may face persistent problems.		Open
92	Sub-group	05-Mar-18	Research Methodology sub-group	To draw out in the findings those customer priorities/views that have changed since the research conducted for PR14 and to demonstrate how these are to be reflected in the business plan.		Open
93	Sub-group	05-Mar-18	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to provide further information on how SEW estimated 95% of its NHH customer base was covered by the research. SEW to provide information on the characteristics of its businesses and the final segmentation approach used. (The CCG will not be able to establish if the NHH research is reaching who it needs to without this information).		Open
94	Sub-group	05-Mar-18	Research Methodology sub-group	The Sub-Group challenged the company to articulate where their segmentation approach would overlay on the research outlined and how that would then be applied to the business plan.		Open
95						
96						
97						
98						
99						
100						

CUSTOMER CHALLENGE GROUP ACTION LOG

REF	FUNCTION	DESCRIPTION	OWNER	DATE RAISED	DEADLINE	COMPLETE	COMMENTS
A0016	Engagement Sub-Group	The Company agreed to update the draft terms of reference and circulate a 'tracked change' version to the Chair by the end of June 2017.	OM	15/06/2017		Yes	
A0017	Engagement Sub-Group	LS to send comments on slide 8 of paper 3 through via email to the Sub-Group.	LS	15/06/2017		Yes	Research graphic explains what research methods chosen and why
A0018	Engagement Sub-Group	The Company to confirm who owns the IP of the App that is being developed for the pre-task exercise.	AL	15/06/2017		Yes	Not relevant as no significant IP involved
A0019	Engagement Sub-Group	The Company to request information from Accent about their current client base and how they ensure any conflicts of interest are managed with other clients and SEW work.	AL	15/06/2017		Yes	Sent via email 17/01/18
A0020	Engagement Sub-Group	LD to circulate UKWIR guidance	LD	15/06/2017		?	Check with CCG - no longer required
A0021	Engagement Sub-Group	The Company to consider how the community can be involved in creating solutions as part of the engagement activity.	AL/LD	15/06/2017		Yes	Part of co-creation discussions
A0022	Engagement Sub-Group	The Company to confirm which stakeholders will be included in the inception meeting proposed in the research.	AL/LD	15/06/2017		Yes	Part of co-creation discussions
A0023	Engagement Sub-Group	LD to include in his update to the next CCG meeting - What the Company hopes to have at the end of this engagement? - How this information will be used?	LD	15/06/2017	06/09/2017	Yes	Covered in WRMP update to CCG in November
A0024	Engagement Sub-Group	MB suggested that phase 2 community groups could include an outside view – potentially some of the expertise of the EFG. The Company confirmed they would review this suggestion.	LD	15/06/2017		Yes	
A0025	Engagement Sub-Group	Members to send dates of any holiday in the next few months – NB to collate into spreadsheet.	NB	15/06/2017		Yes	
A0026	Engagement Sub-Group	Front sheets on all proposals to show which point on the engagement programme the proposal is relating to.	AL	15/06/2017		Yes	
A0042	Engagement Sub-Group	JG to reword the objective shown in Section 2 of the report	JG	24/08/2017		Yes	
A0043	Engagement Sub-Group	Session with CCG members to go through the Experian data to use group knowledge to use the data to the best advantage, and help specify the requirements for the 'customer insight hub'.		24/08/2017		Yes	Data presentation made to Vulnerability Sub Group in November - check whether this should be issued to full CCG
A0044	Engagement Sub-Group	Add to graphic as to where the company thinks co-creation is and is meant by it.		24/08/2017		Yes	Part of co-creation CCG note and new approach to co-creation of vulnearbility strategy
A0045	Engagement Sub-Group	The Group should write what it means when it says co-creation and co-delivery to enable the Group and the Company to compare meanings.		24/08/2017		Yes	
A0046	Engagement Sub-Group	Share Willingness to pay research proposal to the Research Sub-Group for comment.		24/08/2017		Yes	
A0047	Engagement Sub-Group	AL to send out a survey to book the next meeting date.	AL	24/08/2017		Yes	
A0075	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to add audience and intention of document to future papers.	JG	06/10/2017		Yes	Will be included in each cover note.
A0076	Engagement Sub-Group	Research findings report to be shared with the whole CCG Group.	AL	06/10/2017		Yes	Email sent 20/11/17
A0077	Engagement Sub-Group	Sub-Group to provide further comments via email to JG.	Sub-Group	06/10/2017		Yes	Discussed at main CCG Meeting
A0078	Engagement Sub-Group	JG to update report with comments from Sub-Group.	JG	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0079	Engagement Sub-Group	JG to update graphic to include KG suggestion	JG	06/10/2017		Yes	

CUSTOMER CHALLENGE GROUP ACTION LOG

REF	FUNCTION	DESCRIPTION	OWNER	DATE RAISED	DEADLINE	COMPLETE	COMMENTS
A0080	Engagement Sub-Group	JG to add a column to the dashboard to show how the information will be used in the business and who in the business will have sight of it.	JG	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0081	Engagement Sub-Group	JG to include qualitative statistics in an update to the dashboard.	JG	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0082	Engagement Sub-Group	JG to think of ways to incorporate horizon scanning and societal measures in a new part of the dashboard.	JG	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0083	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW speak to Richard Lavender about segments.	OM	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0084	Engagement Sub-Group	OM to send Sub-Group the SIC (Standard Industrial Classification) codes that sit below the SME segment.	OM	06/10/2017		Yes	Sent via email 17/01/18
A0085	Engagement Sub-Group	OM to send a list of businesses included within the segments.	OM	06/10/2017		Yes	Sent via email 17/01/18
A0086	Engagement Sub-Group	OM to discuss breaking down the SME segment further with KS.	OM	06/10/2017		Yes	SME's can be split by consumption band. Approach discussed with R.Lavendar and agreed we would not split SME's at this point but keep this under review.
A0087	Engagement Sub-Group	OM and AL to discuss CCWater report with Accent.	OM	06/10/2017		Yes	Accent completed the CCWater research into NHH segmentation. Accent have reviewed the segments from that research and have confirmed that they are in line with our proposed segments.
A0088	Engagement Sub-Group	WTP materials and non-household segments as soon as possible to whole CCG.	AL	06/10/2017		Yes	Included in November CCG meeting
A0089	Engagement Sub-Group	The earlier discussed engagement paper and graphic should also be sent out with the papers for the next CCG meeting.	AL	06/10/2017		Yes	Included in November CCG meeting
A0090	Engagement Sub-Group	ZM draft note to group to say they should expect the above.	ZM	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0092	Engagement Sub-Group	AL to talk to Accent regarding clearer definitions of terms around vulnerable customers/hard to reach	AL	06/10/2017		Yes	Sent via email 25/01/18
A0093	Engagement Sub-Group	OM to follow up with LD on WRMP engagement - group expressed real concerns about the lack of visibility on the engagement programme around this.	OM	06/10/2017		Yes	Included in November CCG meeting
A0094	Engagement Sub-Group	NB to chase LD on outstanding paper for the CCG.	NB	06/10/2017	01/11/2017	Yes	
A0135	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to circulate a short research specification for the vulnerability engagement work in particular the co-design work so that Leslie and Mairi can put it round their networks to identify people with appropriate skills.	OM	23/11/2017		Ongoing	On agenda for January 2018 sub-group meeting
A0136	Engagement Sub-Group	LS and MB to share with SEW any thoughts they have on triangulation experts.	CCG	23/11/2017		Yes	
A0137	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to include a glossary of terms in the triangulation document	JG	23/11/2017		Ongoing	Will incorporate into triangulation exercise outputs/documentation
A0138	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to find out Accent's credentials on deliberative work	AL	23/11/2017		Yes	information received from Accent under review by SEW. File saved in the folder (see action A0019) Sent to CCG in Jan 18.
A0139	Engagement Sub-Group	ZM to talk to Richard Lavender at the Chamber of Commerce on his views on segmentation of NHH beyond water consumption.	ZM	23/11/2017		Yes	RL view feed into NHH engagment research. RL feed back on obs from NHH focus groups.

CUSTOMER CHALLENGE GROUP ACTION LOG

REF	FUNCTION	DESCRIPTION	OWNER	DATE RAISED	DEADLINE	COMPLETE	COMMENTS
A0139	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to explore with Supercharge if they can include the potential bill figure on a SEW looking bill/frequency of a person's bills so as close to real life feeling as possible.	OM	23/11/2017		Yes	To be discussed at Research Sub-Group on 3rd January. Doesn't fit with the rest of the design of the website.
A0140	Engagement Sub-Group	Sub-Group members to try and download/log on to Zoom.	CCG	23/11/2017		Yes	
A0149	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to add a key for the words in italics.	OM	03/01/2018		Yes	Updated Engagement Overview presented to full CCG in Jan 18.
A0150	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to review the positioning of the communications plan.	OM	03/01/2018		Yes	Updated Engagement Overview presented to full CCG in Jan 18.
A0151	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to review the positioning of the horizon scanning.	OM	03/01/2018		Yes	Updated Engagement Overview presented to full CCG in Jan 18.
A0152	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to review directional flows of the arrows.	OM	03/01/2018		Yes	Updated Engagement Overview presented to full CCG in Jan 18.
A0153	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to review wording for wider societal deliverables.	OM	03/01/2018		Yes	Updated Engagement Overview presented to full CCG in Jan 18.
A0154	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to review graphic to try and clarify the circularity of the process.	OM	03/01/2018		Yes	Updated Engagement Overview presented to full CCG in Jan 18.
A0155	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to update a key terms document and include the document with every meeting's paper packs	NB	03/01/2018			
A0156	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to add key customer data on to the engagement dashboard.	LH	03/01/2018		Yes	
A0157	Engagement Sub-Group	ZM to think about the crossover of data from both Sub-Groups.	ZM	03/01/2018			will explore potential as sub-groups are on the same day for overlap/ joint session.
A0158	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to add introduction section showing where SEW have come from, the journey so far, how it has shaped the engagement strategy, the benefit of the experience to date and why they have taken the customer centric approach we have	JG	03/01/2018		Yes	Engagement Strategy updated but needs CCG sign off
A0159	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to review text regarding 'purpose of this document' to include SEW role as a provider of essential service.	JG	03/01/2018		Yes	Engagement Strategy updated but needs CCG sign off
A0160	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW revise wording of sections 2.1 and 2.3 to make this more authentic and inspiring – outlining the true value of engagement and why this is important to SEW.	JG	03/01/2018		Yes	Engagement Strategy updated but needs CCG sign off
A0161	Engagement Sub-Group	Bullet point 2.1 suggested amendment of "our employees recommend us as a good place to work" to be "great place to work"	JG	03/01/2018		Yes	Engagement Strategy updated but needs CCG sign off
A0162	Engagement Sub-Group	Customer participation section – explain what co-creation and co-delivery mean to us, in our language to reduce the use of the terms co-creation and co delivery	JG	03/01/2018		Yes	Engagement Strategy updated but needs CCG sign off
A0163	Engagement Sub-Group	In some sections give examples of what is meant – e.g. what we've done and what we think we might do	JG	03/01/2018		Yes	Engagement Strategy updated but needs CCG sign off
A0164	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to review the use of the word legitimacy to ensure consistent meaning and to review the paper generally to ensure plain English or any jargon explained	JG	03/01/2018		Yes	Engagement Strategy updated but needs CCG sign off
A0165	Engagement Sub-Group	More visual summaries for quick reference	JG	03/01/2018		Yes	Engagement Strategy updated but needs CCG sign off
A0166	Engagement Sub-Group	Sub-Group will be providing more detailed comments over the next couple of weeks	Sub-Group	03/01/2018			
A0167	Engagement Sub-Group	Move CCG circle to 'Our Regulators and Statutory consultees ring in the rain drop diagram on page 11.	JG	03/01/2018		Yes	Engagement Strategy updated but needs CCG sign off
A0168	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to send out Willingness to Pay attributes paper to Sub-Group and Rupika.	NB	03/01/2018		Yes	Email sent 03/01/18 16:00
A0169	Engagement Sub-Group	Sub-Group members to confirm if they would like to partake in the testing of the Supercharge game.	Sub-Group	03/01/2018			

CUSTOMER CHALLENGE GROUP ACTION LOG

REF	FUNCTION	DESCRIPTION	OWNER	DATE RAISED	DEADLINE	COMPLETE	COMMENTS
A0170	Engagement Sub-Group	Sub-Group members to confirm which resilience focus group they will be attending.	Sub-Group	03/01/2018		Yes	
A0171	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to update A0136 to close.	NB	03/01/2018		Yes	
A0172	Engagement Sub-Group	Sub-Group members to inform JO if they would like a ticket to the conference on the 17th January.	Sub-Group	03/01/2018		Yes	